

REMARKS

By means of the present amendment, the claims are amended including for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as amending dependent claims to begin with "The" as opposed to "A". Further amendments include changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--. By these amendments, the claims are not amended to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the outstanding Official Action, restriction is required as between Group 1, claim 2 drawn to device for shaving hairs with a skin contact member defining a skin contact surface, group II, claim 3-5 drawn to a device for shaving hairs with the periodical motion in a reciprocating manner, group III, claims 6-7 drawn to a device for shaving hairs with a pre-tensioning device, group IV, claims 8, 11 -16, drawn to a device for shaving hairs with a transmission system, group V, claim 9, drawn to a device for shaving hairs with the shaving head releasably mounted to the base portion, and group VI, claim 10, drawn to a device for shaving hairs with the cutting member releasably mounted to the shaving head. It is further stated that claim 1 will be examined with the election of any one of groups I-VI.

Election of Species Under Traverse

In response, as a formality merely to comply with §818.03(b), Applicants hereby preliminarily elect claims 3-5, designated as Group II, for an examination on the merits, with traverse regarding claim 16.

Arguments in Support of Traversal of Identification of Claim 16 as
Being in Group IVf


In the Office Action, it is stated that claim 16 is (emphasis added) "drawn to a device for shaving hairs with a transmission system with a shaving head having a coupling member." (See, Office Action, page 4, numbered group IVf.) It is respectfully submitted that claim 16 does not recite the element of a transmission system as stated in the Office Action. While claim 16 does recite "a coupling member by means of which the shaving head can be coupled to a base portion of said device", it is not clear to the Applicants why the coupling member is being interpreted as requiring a transmission system. Claim 1 in pertinent part, acknowledged in the Office Action as reading on each of groups I-VI recites in pertinent part "an actuator for effecting a periodical motion of the cutting member relative to the base portion

..." It is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to read the "coupling member" of claim 16 as requiring a different grouping than the "actuator" of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that claim 16 should be identified as generic to each of groups I-VI and as such, it is respectfully requested that claim 16 be examined along with elected group II.

Applicants further respectfully submit that new claims 17-22 which depend from claim 3 similarly should be identified as belonging to group II and therefore, should also be examined on the merits.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398
Attorney for Applicant(s)
May 8, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101